

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 have been amended. Claims 16 and 17 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alperovich, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,119,014). Alperovich discloses using an identifier tag such as priority one, two, etc. assigned to a message which then displays the message based upon the identifier tag whether the tag be priority, time or location.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include the step of using the identifier tag in place of the referenced information. In this way the referenced information is kept secure. Alperovich does not use what is defined as the identifier tag in place of the information. Alperovich uses the identifier tag to determine what to do with the information or when to send the information.

Thus, Applicant believes Claims 1 and 9, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-6 and 10-13, which ultimately depend on Claims 1 or 9, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 8, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,119,014) in view of Amicangioli (U.S. Pat. No. 6,535,509 B2). Claims 7 and 8 ultimately depend from Claim 1. Claims 14 and 15 ultimately depend from Claim 9. As stated above, Claims 1 and 9 have been amended and are now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 7, 8, 14 and 15 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 16 and 17 are dependent claims that are ultimately dependent on Claims 1 or 9 and which define additional features of the present invention.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 7, 2004

By:


Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg